



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor

Long Beach, CA 90802

FAX (562) 570-6753

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

\$25.00 FILING FEE

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Office of the County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 E. Imperial Highway, #1101
Norwalk, CA 90650

From: Community & Environmental Planning Division
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Date Mailed:

In conformance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, please post this notice for period of 20 days. Enclosed is the required fee of \$25.00 for processing.

Notice is hereby given that the Long Beach City Planning Commission, Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA, proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project listed below:

1. **Project Location:**

2. **Project Title:**

3. **Project Description:**

4. Review period during which the Lead Agency will receive comments on the proposed mitigated Negative Declaration:

Starting Date:

Ending Date:

5. Public Meeting of the Planning Commission

Date:

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

6. Copies of the report and all referenced documents are available for review by contacting the undersigned, or on the web at: www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp.
7. The site is not on any list as enumerated under Section 65965.5 of the California Government Code.
8. The Initial Study may find significant adverse impacts to occur to the following resource areas:
9. The Negative Declaration has no significant impacts.

For additional information contact:

333 West Ocean Boulevard, Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

CITY OF LONG BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT:

I. TITLE:

II. PROPONENT

III. DESCRIPTION

IV. LOCATION

V. HEARING DATE & TIME

VI. HEARING LOCATION

City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FINDING:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Long Beach City Planning Commission has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the Commission hereby finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report because the Mitigation Measures described in the initial study have been added to the project.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

- * If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references.

This document and supporting attachments are provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects only. Supplemental information is on file and may be reviewed in the office listed above. The decision making body will review this document and potentially many other sources of information before considering the proposed project.

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Community and Environmental Planning
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fifth Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

INITIAL STUDY

- 1. Project title:**
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
- 3. Contact person and phone number:**
- 4. Project location:**
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:**
- 6. General Plan:**
- 7. Zoning:**

8. Description of project:

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	Noise
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation	Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the Environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with A Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 1 5063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM – Would the project:

- a) Result in a significant loss of pervious surface?
- b) Create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?
- c) Violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection?
- b) Police protection?
- c) Schools?
- d) Parks?
- e) Other public facilities?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION –				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Following this page:

Pages 15 to 40	Discussion of Environmental Impacts
Pages 41 to 42	Mitigation Measures
Attachment 1	Vicinity Map
Attachment 2	Air Photo of proposed project site
Attachment 3	“No Further Requirements” letter for the proposed project site from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, dated October 23, 2003.
Attachment 4	E-mail from Robert Ehe at the Los Angeles Region of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer, dated June 7, 2004.
Attachment 5	Targhee, Inc. Groundwater Monitoring Report for 1368 Oregon Avenue, dated October 1, 2003.
Attachment 6	Targhee, Inc. Remediation of Hexavalent Chromium-Impacted Soil Report for 1368 Oregon Avenue, dated October 1, 2003.
Attachment 7	Targhee, Inc. Results of an Evaluation of Subfloor Conditions and a Remedial Action Plan for 1368 Oregon Avenue, dated August 7, 2003.

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project would be located within an existing single-story building on Oregon Avenue in the Magnolia Industrial Area (MIG). The MIG area is an established industrial neighborhood. The proposed project would not have an impact on any scenic vista.

b) **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

No Impact:

The project site is located in a highly urbanized setting. Development of the proposed project would not impact any scenic resources. In addition, the project site is not located on or near a designated State Scenic Highway.

c) **Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation:

The proposed project would be a permanent homeless shelter that would operate between the hours of 4:30pm and 8:30am. During the hours of operation, the shelter is where the clients would eat, bathe and sleep. Each client would have some storage space for personal belongings in drawers underneath their bed.

It would not be unusual, however, for the clients to have personal belongings that would not fit into the allotted drawer space. In the event that shelter clients have personal belongings that must be stored on-site beyond their individual assigned drawers, the following mitigation measure shall apply:

- I-1 All personal belongings of shelter clients shall be stored on-site and out of public view. Any exterior storage of belongings shall be limited to the fenced-in portion of the property located along the northern half of the project site. For privacy and security, battens or another form of screening shall be incorporated into the existing fencing or an alternative form of screened fencing shall be installed.

- d) **Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed homeless shelter would be required to have exterior security lighting. However, any such lighting would not be expected to have a negative impact upon the surrounding industrial area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The proposed project would be located within a section of the city that has been developed for well over half a century. Development of the proposed project would have no effect upon any agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to possibly some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon

monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

No Impact:

The Southern California Association of Governments has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach Air Quality Element that calls for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth. No impact is anticipated.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than Significant Impact:

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

To determine whether a project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 1).

Table 1. SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds(lbs/day)	Operational Thresholds(lbs/day)
ROC	75	55
NO _x	100	55
CO	550	550
PM ₁₀	150	150

SO _x	150	150
-----------------	-----	-----

Construction emissions would be limited to interior improvements of the building for the proposed homeless shelter as well as minor exterior improvements, such as parking space striping. Therefore, construction emissions would be estimated to be well below threshold levels. The estimated emissions that would be produced during the duration of the tenant improvements would be negligible. The sources of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-1 Screening Table for Estimating Total Construction Emissions. The table below indicates the results.

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Project Emissions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

Estimated automobile emissions from the project are listed in the table below. The sources of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-7 Screening Table for Estimating Mobile Source Operation Emissions. The primary source of operational emissions is vehicle trips of which this project is unlikely to produce significant new vehicle trips. Please also see XVI (a) and (b) supra for discussion. Based upon these estimates, the proposed project would not exceed threshold levels for mobile emissions. The table below indicates the results.

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Exhaust Emissions	8.88	5.28	87.36	.72
AQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

- c) **Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

Less than Significant Impact:

Please see III (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- d) **Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

No Impact:

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, the elderly, and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. The proposed project would not be anticipated to produce significant levels of any emission that could affect sensitive receptors.

- e) **Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

No Impact:

The proposed project would be a year-round homeless shelter within an existing building. The proposed land use would not be expected to create any objectionable odors that would affect the surrounding population.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The project site is located within a highly urbanized portion of the city and the proposed project would occur within an existing structure. As a result, the questions from the environmental checklist for this category can be addressed with one response.

Would the project:

- a) **Have a substantial adverse impact either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**
- b) **Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**
- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**
- e) **Conflict with any local policies ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**
- f) **Conflict with the provision of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact:

As stated, the proposed project would operate in an established, urbanized portion of the city. The surrounding industrial neighborhood is mainly concrete and the only vegetation is either planted street trees or sparse native species in the form of weeds. There is no evidence of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations.

The proposed site is not located in a protected wetlands area. Also, the development of the proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with the migratory movement of any wildlife species. The biological habitat and species diversity is limited to that typically found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California settings.

No adverse impacts would be anticipated to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

In terms of background, there is some evidence to indicate that primitive people inhabited portions of the city as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient people have been destroyed as the city has been developed. Of the archaeological sites remaining, many of them are concentrated in the southeast sector of the city. With regard to the proposed project, a year-round homeless shelter in an existing structure, no adverse impacts would be anticipated to cultural resources. As a result, the questions from the environmental checklist for this category can be addressed with one response.

Would the project:

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?**

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?**
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

No Impact.

The proposed project would have no impact on any historical resource, nor would it require any excavation. Only tenant improvements in the interior and on the exterior of an existing building would be required. In addition, the project site is located outside the area of the City expected to have the higher probability of latent artifacts.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The proposed project would be located outside of all of the special study zones for earthquake faults as illustrated on Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan.

- a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

Less Than Significant Impact.

No faults are known to pass beneath the site, and the area is not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The most significant fault system in the vicinity is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. Other potentially active faults in the area are the Richfield Fault, the Marine Stadium Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault and the Los Alamitos Fault. No significant impact is anticipated.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking at the proposed site if a seismic event occurred along the fault. However, there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to a given location. Given these variables it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. However, the construction improvements for the proposed shelter must conform to all current state and local building codes.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the proposed project is located on the fringe of the area labeled "Liquefaction Potential Significant" on Plate 7, the Source Base Map prepared by the Bureau of Engineering. This status is consistent with much of the Magnolia Industrial Area, the Wrigley neighborhood, and most of Long Beach west of the Los Angeles River. According to the Seismic Safety Element, the potential for liquefaction at a given location in the event of an earthquake would depend upon the level of shaking, the groundwater conditions, and the subsurface soil conditions at that particular location.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact.

No landslides are anticipated to occur on the site of the proposed project. No impact would be anticipated.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No Impact.

The proposed project would not result in any soil erosion. The project would consist of construction improvements on the interior and exterior of an existing building. No impact would be anticipated.

c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact.

Please see VI. (b) supra for discussion.

- d) **Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

No Impact.

Please see VI. (b) supra for discussion.

- e) **Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

No Impact.

Please see VI. (b) supra for discussion.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The proposed project, a year-round homeless shelter, would be located in an existing building at 1368 Oregon Avenue in the Magnolia Industrial Area. The building was constructed in 1930 and, from 1977 to 1996, was occupied by Nova Techno Corporation, a machining and chrome plating business. The business utilized three vaulted open tanks inside the building, two of which were used for plating while the third was used as a rinse tank.

The building was sold to its present owner within the last eight months. Prior to the sale, the previous owner of the building had remediation work done that involved the testing of soil and groundwater underneath the building and the removal of contaminated soil from underneath the building. The soil contained hexavalent chromium. In addition to the removal of contaminated soil, the remediation process also involved the removal of the two plating tanks.

All of the remediation work was performed by Targhee, Inc., an environmental consulting firm. Following the completion of the work by Targhee, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (the Regional Board) issued a "no further requirements" letter for the project site. The letter cleared the project site for sale to a new owner and for future use as an industrial building. The Regional Board's "no further requirements" letter dated October 23, 2003, is included in this document as Attachment 3. Documents prepared by Targhee, Inc. for the work completed at the project site are included for reference purposes as Attachments 5, 6 and 7. The Targhee documents describe in full the testing and remediation that took place.

- a) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

No Impact:

The proposed project would be a year-round overnight homeless shelter that would accommodate a maximum of 60 clients. The proposed project would not be in the business of routinely transporting, using or disposing of hazardous materials and, therefore, would not be anticipated to create any sort of hazard through those practices.

- b) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation:

The Regional Board issued a “no further requirements” letter that cleared the project site for future use as an industrial building. The proposed year-round homeless shelter would be identified as a residential land use rather than an industrial land use. This fact triggered the solicitation of an opinion from the Regional Board regarding the proposed shelter. The Regional Board responded with phone calls and an e-mail from Robert Ehe, a Water Resource Control Engineer at the Regional Board. The e-mail stated that the “no further requirements” letter had a few conditions: (1) that the three groundwater monitoring wells located underneath the building on the project site shall be maintained and the property owner shall notify the Regional Board of any disturbance of the wells; (2) that written notification must be provided to the Regional Board within 72 hours should any contamination be encountered; and (3) that written notification must be submitted to the Regional Board should a change in land use be proposed for the project site.

In the e-mail dated June 7, 2004, Mr. Ehe further stated the following:

“There was no disclosure to Regional Board staff that a change of use was intended, in fact this case closure was granted with the expectation of continued industrial use. It is our opinion that the city should conduct its own health risk assessment prior to any change of property use. We request you send the Executive Officer of the Regional Board a detailed letter explaining and justifying the intended change of use for this property as soon as possible.”

The e-mail from Mr. Ehe is included in its entirety as Attachment 4. In addition to speaking with Mr. Robert Ehe, Angela Reynolds, the City’s Environmental

Officer, conducted a telephone conversation with Mr. Robert Sams, legal counsel to the Regional Board. Mr. Sams indicated that the applicant/property owner would be obligated to contact the Regional Board because the use of the building was changing from industrial to residential. Mr. Sams also stated that the Regional Board would require a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) before they would issue another "no further requirements" for a residential use.

Mr. Sams further explained that, pursuant to Sections 25220 and 25230 of the California Health and Safety Code, the applicant/property owner was required to also contact the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC). Ms. Reynolds contacted the DTSC and was informed that, for a residential use, the owner of the property was required to submit the following information to the DTSC before there could be an environmental clearance issued: (1) A thorough site characterization; (2) a document detailing the extent of contamination at the site; (3) a Human Health Risk Assessment; (4) established clean-up goals; and (5) a removal action work plan.

Given the opinion from the Regional Board legal counsel, the following mitigation measures shall be required for the proposed project:

- VII-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant/property owner shall satisfy the request of the Regional Board for a detailed letter explaining and justifying the intended change of use for the project site. Further, the applicant/property owner shall obtain from the Regional Board a "No Further Requirements" letter for 1368 Oregon Avenue for the proposed residential land use. The letter shall be submitted to the Environmental Health Bureau of the Department of Health and Human Services.
- VII-2 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant /property owner shall have contacted the Department of Toxic Substance Control and completed the required process for environmental clearance for a residential land use, including the preparation of a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) for the project site. All completed documentation shall be submitted to the Environmental Health Bureau of the Department of Health and Human Services

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact:

Operation of the proposed homeless shelter would not include the discharge of hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous

material, substances or waste. The function of the shelter would to provide overnight care and guidance for up to 60 clients.

- d) **Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No Impact.

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. The most recent version of the Cortese List (current as of 06-08-2004) does not list the project site as contaminated with hazardous materials. For the record, of the 75 sites listed in Los Angeles County, only one site is located in Long Beach. Source: www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List.cfm

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

The proposed project site is not located within the airport land use plan.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

Please see VII (e) supra for discussion.

- g) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation:

The proposed project would involve a maximum of 60 clients sleeping in the shelter on any given night. If there were to be an evacuation due to a hazard or an emergency, the shelter clients would be viewed as a concentration of "persons in need", similar to adults or children in a daycare setting who would need assistance in evacuating. The shelter would be required by code to have posted evacuation routes to be utilized in an emergency. In addition,

the following mitigation measure would require the operators of the shelter to have an evacuation plan on file with the Fire Department. The plan would address a safe evacuation that would protect and accommodate all of the shelter clients as well as the shelter staff.

VII-3 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy, the applicant shall prepare, and submit for review and approval, an evacuation plan that addresses all aspects of a necessary evacuation from the shelter due to a hazard or emergency. The plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief or his appointee and shall be submitted to the Fire Department to be kept on file.

- h) **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?**

No Impact:

The proposed site is within an urbanized setting and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Flood Insurance Administration has prepared a new Flood Hazard Map designating potential flood zones, (Based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) which was adopted in July 1998.

The proposed project would comply with all state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality.

- a) **Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

No Impact:

Development of the proposed homeless shelter would not violate any wastewater discharge standards. The project site is in an urbanized area that is not directly adjacent to any major water source. All storm and sanitary sewer drains are currently in place and the industrial neighborhood where the project site is located is fully developed.

- b) **Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

No Impact

The proposed project would not involve any grading or excavation. The proposed project become established in an existing industrial building. The operation of the proposed land use would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater supplies.

- c) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

No Impact:

Please see VIII (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- d) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?**

No Impact:

Please see VIII (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- e) **Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?**

No Impact:

Please see VIII (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- f) **Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?**

No Impact.

Please see VIII (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project, a year-round homeless shelter, would be located within a 100 year flood inundation area according to Plate 10 in the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan. The Element states that the intervening ground between flood control dams and the city of Long Beach is generally low and flat, and that much of the water from a flood would be expected to dissipate before reaching Long Beach.

- h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No Impact.

The proposed project does not involve the construction of any new structures. The proposed homeless shelter would occupy a structure that is already in place in an established industrial area.

- i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The two flood control dams that would flow into the Los Angeles River are the Sepulveda Dam and Hansen Dam. According to the Seismic Safety Element, the Los Angeles River channel would be expected to contain a failure of the Sepulveda Dam. The failure of Hansen Dam, however, could cause flooding as far south as north and west Long Beach. The site of the proposed project is located on the southeast edge of the 100 year flood inundation area that would be affected by Hansen Dam.

- j) Would the project be inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as shown in the Long Beach Seismic Element.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

The proposed year-round homeless shelter would be located within an existing industrial building on land that is located in General Plan Land Use District “#9G”, General Industrial, and in Zoning District “IG”, General Industrial. Per the Zoning Division, an Administrative Use Permit (AUP) is required in order for the proposed land use to locate in the “IG” Zoning District.

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would be located within the Magnolia Industrial Area (MIG), which is an established industrial neighborhood with its own assessment district. The idea of the proposed land use has generated different points of view within the Magnolia Industrial Area, but the actual land use would not physically divide the MIG area.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Magnolia Industrial Area is located within the Central Long Beach Redevelopment Area. As part of the discretionary process, the proposed land use should be analyzed as to whether or not it would be in conformance or in conflict with the overall goals and objectives for the growth and improvement of the Central Long Beach Redevelopment Area.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

No Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would be located in a established, developed sector of the city. It would not conflict with any applicable habitat or natural communities conservation plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the city have

diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The proposed site does not contain any oil extraction operations and development of the proposed project would not be anticipated to have a negative impact on this resource. There are no other known mineral resources on the site that could be negatively impacted by development.

- a) **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No Impact.

Establishment of the proposed project would occur in an existing structure and would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

- b) **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

No Impact.

Again, establishment of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any locally-imported mineral resource.

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

Development of the proposed project would not involve major construction or the need to create any new drainage or filtering system. No significant impacts are anticipated with respect to NPDES requirements.

- a) **Would the project result in a significant loss of pervious surface?**

No Impact.

The project site is completely developed with a 5,310 square foot structure on a 8,446 square foot lot with hardscaped areas. The proposed project would not result in a significant loss of pervious surface.

- b) **Would the project create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would occupy interior and exterior space at an existing industrial building. Drainage systems are in place in the industrial neighborhood. There would be expected periodic washing down of the enclosed, exterior portion of the site. The impact of the project upon the storm drain system would be similar or less than other existing industrial buildings in the Magnolia Industrial Area.

c) Would the project violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

No Impact.

Please see XI (b) supra for discussion.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Measuring noise levels involves intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA CNEL for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Noise Ordinance that sets exterior and interior noise standards. The project area is located in District 1 of the Noise District Map, which sets daytime (7AM - 10PM) exterior noise limits to 45 dBA and night (10PM - 7AM) exterior noise limits to 35 dBA.¹

a) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Development of the proposed project is not expected to create noise levels in excess of those established by the Long Beach City Ordinance. During the period of construction improvements, the proposed project may cause temporary

increases within the ambient noise levels but it is not expected to exceed established standards. Project construction must conform with the Noise Ordinance. As stated in §8.80.202, “no person shall operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for construction, alternation, repair, remodeling, drilling, demolition or any other related building activity which would produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m.

b) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

No Impact.

The proposed project would involve interior and exterior improvements in an existing structure and would not be expected to generate any ground borne vibrations or noises.

c) Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact.

Ambient noise levels in the general vicinity of the proposed project sight are not anticipated to increase significantly from the development

d) Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would be established in a building that has been vacant for a period of time. Development of the proposed shelter would involve construction noise typically associated with tenant improvements. Such noise could create a temporary increase in the ambient noise level in the surrounding area. Once the improvements have been completed, the noise levels created by the homeless shelter would likely be consistent and non-disruptive.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would not be located within an airport land use plan.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?**

No Impact.

Nor would the proposed homeless shelter would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth largest in California. According to the 2000 Census, Long Beach has a population of 461,522, which presents a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census. According to the 2000 Census, there were 163,088 housing units in Long Beach, with a citywide vacancy rate of 6.32 percent. It is projected that a total population of approximately 499,705 persons will inhabit the City of Long Beach by the year 2010.

- a) **Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project, a year-round homeless shelter, would add a residential population to the Magnolia Industrial Area. This population, however, would not be permanent because clients of the shelter would have maximum stays of 90 days. Therefore, the population would be fluid, and not substantial.

- b) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact.

The establishment of the proposed homeless shelter would not displace any existing housing units.

- c) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact.

The establishment of the proposed homeless shelter would not displace any people from their homes.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

The Long Beach Police Department serves the project site. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions; East, West, North and South.

The City of Long Beach is primarily served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the Cities of Signal Hill, and most of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity.

Would the proposed project have an adverse impact upon any of the following public services:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed land use would be a year-round homeless shelter that would operate between the hours of 4:30pm and 8:30am. The shelter would serve single men and women (no families or children). In case of an emergency, all occupants of the building would need to be able to egress the building safely and quickly. Please refer to Mitigation Measure VII-3, which requires an evacuation plan for the shelter. The Fire Code would also require the shelter to have posted an evacuation route for the staff and clients of the shelter to utilize in the event of an emergency.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would be served by the West Division of the Police Department. Through the Technical Advisory Committee, the Police Department provided comments to the applicant regarding crime prevention and

public safety. The management plan submitted for the shelter includes a section on security, the fact that the shelter will utilize an independent security company, and that they intend to work closely with the Police Department. In addition, the Magnolia Industrial Area, with its own assessment district, contracts for additional security for the MIG properties. The homeless shelter would be expected to become a member of MIG.

c) Schools?

No Impact:

Based upon the description of how the proposed shelter would operate, it would not be expected to have any impact upon the Long Beach Unified School District.

d) Parks?

No Impact.

Based upon the description of how the proposed shelter would operate, it would not be expected to have any impact upon the park facilities in the City.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Based upon the description of how the proposed shelter would operate, there could be an impact upon the Multi Service Center in terms of the number of clients it would be expected to be responsible for each weekday (up to 60 individuals).

XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project, a year-round homeless shelter for single adults, would not require the development of new recreational amenities. Based upon the description of how the proposed shelter would operate, it would not be expected to have an impact upon the park facilities in the City. However, the Police Department, in their comments to the Technical Advisory Committee, did express concerns regarding a potential further impact upon the 14th Street greenbelt park and the surrounding area.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter does not include any recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect upon the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant growth. Continued growth is expected into the next decade. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand, if unmanaged, could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- a) Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would be located in the Magnolia Industrial Area and would occupy a building that has been vacant for several years. The traffic load generated by the staff and vans transporting clients of the shelter would represent an increase over the traffic that currently exists in the industrial neighborhood. The increase in traffic, however, would not be expected to exceed the anticipated load assumed for the industrial building where the shelter would be located.

- b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Less than Significant Impact:

The proposed homeless shelter would be located in an industrial area where the streets and intersections have been designed to accommodate the square footage of the existing structures. The increase in trips, both from shelter staff and from transport of the clients to and from the shelter, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, the established levels of service standards.

- c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No Impact.

The proposed project would have no impact upon air traffic patterns and is unrelated to air traffic.

- d) Would the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would not have an impact on any circulation patterns. The only changes and improvements occurring as a result of the project would construction improvements to the existing structure where the shelter would be located.

- e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

No Impact.

The shelter management plan proposes that clients would be unloaded and loaded from vans along the north side of the building. The same access would be available for emergency vehicles to utilize. No inadequate access for emergency vehicles would be anticipated.

- f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the site plan submitted by the applicant, the proposed homeless shelter would have five diagonal parking spaces located at the northwest corner of the building. At the time the Mitigated Negative Declaration began to circulate, it had not been determined if the location of these spaces was adequate. In the event the applicant would be required to propose an alternative parking plan, the project site would also be able to accommodate some parking spaces on the northeast portion of the project site.

- f) Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

No Impact.

The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed homeless shelter would operate within an existing industrial building and would put demands upon the utilities and service systems similar to that of a business functioning in the building. In this environmental checklist category, the questions can all be answered with one response.

Would the project::

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?**
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter would not be expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system. The shelter would be established in an existing building that was taken into account when the surrounding utility and service systems were planned.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Overall, the proposed land use is one that would raise questions wherever it would propose to locate. The emphasis in this document has been upon the actual structure where the homeless shelter would be located and the manner in which it would operate.

- a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

No Impact.

The proposed project would be located within an established urbanized setting. There would be no anticipated negative impact to any known fish or wildlife habitat or species.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed homeless shelter, if managed and operated as proposed, would have a less than significant impact in comparison to other similar land uses. The shelter would not be anticipated to have a significant cumulative considerable effect upon the environment.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

If the mitigation measures listed on following pages are satisfied, then the environmental effects of the proposed homeless shelter would be reduced and it would not be expected to cause substantial adverse effects upon the staff, the clients or the surrounding environment.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION 17-04 FOR PROJECT ACHIEVE HOMELESS SHELTER 1368 OREGON AVENUE LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

I. AESTHETICS

- I-1 All personal belongings of shelter clients shall be stored on-site and out of public view. Any exterior storage of belongings shall be limited to the fenced-in portion of the property located along the northern half of the project site. For privacy and security, battens or another form of screening shall be incorporated into the existing fencing or an alternative form of screened fencing shall be installed.

TIMING: Field inspection prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

ENFORCEMENT: Planning Bureau

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- VII-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant/property owner shall satisfy the request of the Regional Board for a detailed letter explaining and justifying the intended change of use for the project site. Further, the applicant/property owner shall obtain from the Regional Board a "No Further Requirements" letter for 1368 Oregon Avenue for the proposed residential land use. The letter shall be submitted to the Environmental Health Bureau of the Department of Health and Human Services.

TIMING: Prior to issuance of building permits.

ENFORCEMENT: Environmental Health Bureau
Department of Health and Human Services

- VII-2 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant /property owner shall have contacted the Department of Toxic Substance Control and completed the required process for environmental clearance for a residential land use, including the preparation of a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) for the project site. All completed documentation

shall be submitted to the Environmental Health Bureau of the Department of Health and Human Services

TIMING: Prior to issuance of building permits.

ENFORCEMENT: Environmental Health Bureau
Department of Health and Human Services

- VII-3 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy, the applicant shall prepare, and submit for review and approval, an evacuation plan that addresses all aspects of a necessary evacuation from the shelter due to a hazard or emergency. The plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief or his appointee and shall be submitted to the Fire Department to be kept on file.

TIMING: Prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

ENFORCEMENT: Fire Department